

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

HERMAN OVERPECK, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

FEDEX CORPORATION, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 18-cv-07553-PJH

**ORDER DENYING DEFENDANTS'
MOTION FOR RELIEF FROM
NONDISPOSITIVE PRETRIAL ORDER
OF MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

Re: Dkt. No. 70

Before the court is defendants' motion pursuant to Civil Local Rule 72-2 for relief from a discovery order issued by Magistrate Judge Ryu.

A district court's review of a magistrate judge's pretrial order is conducted under a "clearly erroneous" or "contrary to law standard." Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(a). A magistrate judge's resolution of a discovery dispute is "entitled to great deference." Doubt v. NCR Corp., Case No. 09-cv-5917-SBA, 2011 WL 5914284, at *2 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 28, 2011). A district court should not overturn a magistrate judge's order simply because it "might have weighed differently the various interests and equities," but rather it "must ascertain whether the order was contrary to law." Rivera v. NIBCO, Inc., 364 F.3d 1057, 1063 (9th Cir. 2004).

The court finds nothing in Judge Ryu's order that is clearly erroneous or contrary to law. Accordingly, defendants' motion is DENIED.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: September 30, 2019

/s/ Phyllis J. Hamilton

PHYLLIS J. HAMILTON
United States District Judge